Case 1:13-cv-00868-JSR Document 18 Filed 03/25/13 Page 1 of 8

D353NORC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 NORTH AMERICAN OLIVE OIL, 4 Plaintiff, 5 13 CV 868 (JSR) V. 6 KANGADIS FOODS, 7 Defendant. 8 New York, N.Y. 9 March 5, 2013 11:30 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. JED S. RAKOFF, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 SIDLEY AUSTIN 15 Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: TIMOTHY TREANOR 16 FARRELL FRITZ Attorneys for Defendant 17 BY: MICHAEL SCHOENBERG 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 (In open court)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: North American Olive Oil v.

Kangadis Foods. Will everyone please be seated and will the parties please identify themselves for the record.

MR. TREANOR: Good morning, your Honor. Tim Treanor from the law firm Sidley Austin for the North American Olive Oil Association. With me is a representative from the client, Erin Balch.

MR. SCHOENBERG: Michael Schoenberg from the law firm Farrell Fritz for the defendant Kangadis Foods.

THE COURT: Good morning. I've received a case management plan but it was only I gather from one side. Is there a case management plan you both agreed to?

MR. TREANOR: No, your Honor. What has happened here is we filed our complaint a few weeks ago. The defendant then appeared, and when we called to schedule the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, defense counsel requested an appearance before the Court to discuss various issues, I believe including case management.

We have proposed a case management plan. This conference was only scheduled towards the end of last week, and we have had one discussion about whether we can reach agreement on dates but we have not yet reached agreement.

THE COURT: So we'll do it jointly right now.

MR. SCHOENBERG: May I be heard, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. SCHOENBERG: Okay. First, again, for the defendant, the reason I requested an in-person conference with your Honor is that the defendant Kangadis Foods plans on changing the contents of the tins, the oil tins that are at issue in this case, which is likely going to moot this case. They are doing what the North American Olive Oil Association is asking them to do.

What we would request is some time for them to allow them to ramp up and be able to do that.

THE COURT: No, no, no. We'll set a schedule. If the case gets settled, or otherwise resolved, you'll jointly file a stipulation of dismissal at that time. But, my long experience is that if you don't have a schedule, people don't feel the same urgency to get moving that they should if they're actually going to settle the case.

So this is a jury case. Does either side anticipate any other parties?

MR. TREANOR: Not on the plaintiff's side, your Honor.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SCHOENBERG: No, your Honor, and I believe they are asking for injunctive relief.

THE COURT: Pardon?

MR. SCHOENBERG: I believe they are asking for injunctive relief.

THE COURT: We'll worry about that in a minute.

Amended pleadings may be filed without leave of Court. You suggest March 29. That's fine. First request for production of documents, you suggest March 15, that's fine. And then interrogatories, the only interrogatories I allow are under Local Rule 33.3(a). Have you looked at Local Rule 33.3(a) on the plaintiff's side?

MR. TREANOR: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because you would not have suggested April 22 if you had. So, when you look at that, which I recommend doing before the day is out, you will see that they very narrowly limit the interrogatories to asking for names of persons with knowledge, the location of certain documents, and the amount of damages which may not be relevant in this case. But in any event —

MR. TREANOR: There is a damages --

THE COURT: On a slow day it will take you approximately 30 seconds to draft these interrogatories because the terms are all set forth in the local rules, and they are the only interrogatories I allow. So we'll put that down for March 15 as well.

What kind of expert does plaintiff anticipate having?

MR. TREANOR: We have an expert in olive oil. He's actually a very well known individual, European based. He also — the only complication that we foresee in moving forward full steam ahead and in all aspects with our case is working

with our expert's schedule. Because he actually is an expert on olive oil before a lot of fora, and we have some dates already that I think we can work with.

THE COURT: The date you suggest is April 19. That's fine with the Court. I assume you put it in there after consulting with your expert, yes?

MR. TREANOR: That's to offer, I believe, offer the expert testimony. But in terms of the deposition --

THE COURT: No. It's everything that Rule 26 requires. That's his report, the back up to the report. Yes. So April. We'll get to the deposition in a minute.

Yes, sir.

MR. SCHOENBERG: Well, given the complexity of the case I would just ask for an extended discovery schedule. This is going to be --

THE COURT: No. You've got to be kidding. This is a complex case? Come practice more often in the Southern

District of New York. This is by Southern District standards a very simple case.

Responding expert May 10, that's fine. Now, you suggest on the plaintiff's side that all depositions, including expert depositions, be completed by June 14. And surely, your expert has at least one day between when he issues his report on April 19, and 2 months later when the depositions are to be completed. So, that sounds reasonable to me.

MR. TREANOR: Yes, your Honor, we do.

THE COURT: Request to admit May 20, all discovery to be completed by June 28, moving papers on summary judgment July 8, answering papers July 24, reply papers August 2.

The only of those dates that I don't really agree with, if moving papers on summary judgment are to be filed as you suggest likely, well, on July 8, which is only 10 days after the completion of discovery, and involves the July 4 weekend, then it seems very unreasonable to have the answering papers due not 10 days later, but 16 days later. So I think the answering papers should be due July 19. Reply papers then can be due July 26.

I will set this down for a final pretrial conference as well as oral argument on any summary judgment motion for August.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: August 5 at 4:30.

THE COURT: August 5 at 4:30. Let's talk about any motion for preliminary injunction.

MR. TREANOR: We are prepared to file our motion today and we ask leave of the Court to be able to do so.

THE COURT: You can file your motion today. How long does defense counsel want for his answering papers?

MR. SCHOENBERG: I request three weeks, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can't give you three weeks but I can give you two. Would you like two?

MR. SCHOENBERG: Two would be fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. So, let's get this down.

Preliminary injunction, moving papers March 6, answering papers

March 20, reply papers March 26. And we will have oral

5 argument, or an evidentiary hearing, let's look at April 1st.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: April 1st, you're on the Second Circuit in the morning and at 2 o'clock you have a Markman hearing for a Pfizer case.

THE COURT: Let's say April 1st, at 4 p.m. After I've received the reply papers, I will advise counsel whether we'll have oral argument or whether I need an evidentiary hearing so you'll know that a few days before.

MR. TREANOR: Your Honor, could I ask, on that date, that April 1st date, I'm scheduled to meet with an integrity committee in a corporate investigation to present findings of an investigation on that day in Miami.

THE COURT: All right. My problem is I teach at Columbia on Tuesday and Wednesday early evening. So those are not good days for me for an evidentiary hearing, which I tend to place usually around 4 o'clock and then we go as long as necessary. So let's look at Thursday.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday the 4th there is no trial that day and at 4 o'clock you have an argument.

THE COURT: If there is no trial that day, we could hear you earlier. So, why don't we say April 4 at 11 a.m.

MR. TREANOR: Thank you, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Anything else we need to take up today? 3 MR. TREANOR: Not from the plaintiff. 4 MR. SCHOENBERG: Depending on the rulings requested in 5 the preliminary injunction, defendants might request an motion to dismiss. Should we schedule that now? 6 7 THE COURT: Once you know for sure one way or the other, you don't have to call me if you are not going to file a 8 9 motion. But once you know you are going to file a motion, rather than deal with it now when it is just a potential, 10 jointly call with your adversary. We'll set the schedule at 11 12 that time. 13 MR. SCHOENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 15 MR. TREANOR: Thank you, your Honor. 16 000 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25